

Bill Jennings  
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance  
3536 Rainier Avenue  
Stockton, CA 95204  
Tel: 209-464-5067  
Fax: 209-464-1028  
E-mail: [deltakeep@aol.com](mailto:deltakeep@aol.com)

Mike Jackson  
Law Office of Mike Jackson  
P.O. Box 207  
429 W. Main Street  
Quincy, CA 95971  
Tel: 530-283-1007  
Fax: 530-283-0712  
E-mail: [mjatty@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mjatty@sbcglobal.net)

Andrew Packard  
Law Office of Andrew Packard  
319 Pleasant Street  
Petaluma, CA 94952  
Tel: 707-763-7227  
Fax: 707-763-9227  
E-mail: [andrew@packardlawoffices.com](mailto:andrew@packardlawoffices.com)

For Petitioner California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

**BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**

<b>In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements For )</b>	
<b>The City of Woodland Wastewater Treatment )</b>	
<b>Plant: California Regional Water Quality Control )</b>	
<b>Board – Central Valley Region, Order No. R5-2009- )</b>	<b>PETITION FOR REVIEW</b>
<b>0010; NPDES No. CA0077950 )</b>	
<b>)</b>	

Pursuant to Section 13320 of California Water Code and Section 2050 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (“CSPA” or “petitioner”) petitions the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) to review and vacate the final decision of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region (“Regional Board”) in adopting Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0077950) for City of Woodland Wastewater Treatment Plant, 5 February 2009. See Order No. R5-2009-0010. The issues raised in this petition were raised in timely written comments.

**1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS:**

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance  
3536 Rainier Avenue  
Stockton, California 95204  
Attention: Bill Jennings, Executive Director

**2. THE SPECIFIC ACTION OR INACTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH THE STATE BOARD IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW AND A COPY OF ANY ORDER OR RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL BOARD WHICH IS REFERRED TO IN THE PETITION:**

Petitioner seeks review of Order No. R5-2009-0010. Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES No. CA0077950) for the City of Woodland Wastewater Treatment Plant. A copy of the adopted Order is attached as Attachment No. 1.

**3. THE DATE ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED OR REFUSED TO ACT OR ON WHICH THE REGIONAL BOARD WAS REQUESTED TO ACT:**

5 February 2009

**4. A FULL AND COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE REASONS THE ACTION OR FAILURE TO ACT WAS INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER:**

CSPA submitted a detailed comment letter on 26 December 2008. That letter and the following comments set forth in detail the reasons and points and authorities why CSPA believes the Order fails to comport with statutory and regulatory requirements. The specific reasons the adopted Orders are improper are:

**A. The Permit contains Effluent Limitations less stringent than the existing permit for Settleable Solids and Oil and Grease contrary to the Antibacksliding requirements of the Clean Water Act and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1).**

Under the Clean Water Act (CWA), point source dischargers are required to obtain federal discharge (NPDES) permits and to comply with water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs) in NPDES permits sufficient to make progress toward the achievement of water quality standards or goals. The antibacksliding and antidegradation rules clearly spell out the interest of Congress in achieving the CWA's goal of continued progress toward eliminating all pollutant discharges. Congress clearly chose an overriding environmental interest in clean water through discharge

reduction, imposition of technological controls, and adoption of a rule against relaxation of limitations once they are established.

Upon permit reissuance, modification, or renewal, a discharger may seek a relaxation of permit limitations. However, according to the CWA, relaxation of a WQBEL is permissible only if the requirements of the antibacksliding rule are met. The antibacksliding regulations prohibit EPA from reissuing NPDES permits containing interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions less stringent than the final limits contained in the previous permit, with limited exceptions. These regulations also prohibit, with some exceptions, the reissuance of permits originally based on best professional judgment (BPJ) to incorporate the effluent guidelines promulgated under CWA §304(b), which would result in limits less stringent than those in the previous BPJ-based permit. Congress statutorily ratified the general prohibition against backsliding by enacting §§402(o) and 303(d)(4) under the 1987 Amendments to the CWA. The amendments preserve present pollution control levels achieved by dischargers by prohibiting the adoption of less stringent effluent limitations than those already contained in their discharge permits, except in certain narrowly defined circumstances.

When attempting to backslide from WQBELs under either the antidegradation rule or an exception to the antibacksliding rule, relaxed permit limits must not result in a violation of applicable water quality standards. The general prohibition against backsliding found in §402(o)(1) of the Act contains several exceptions. Specifically, under §402(o)(2), a permit may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant *if*: (A) material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation; (B)(i) information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (ii) the Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section; (C) a less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy [(e.g., Acts of God)]; (D) the permittee has received a permit modification under section 1311(c), 1311(g), 1311(h), 1311(i), 1311(k), 1311(n), or 1326(a) of this title; or (E) the permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit, and has properly operated and maintained the facilities, but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

Even if a discharger can meet either the requirements of the antidegradation rule under §303(d)(4) or one of the statutory exceptions listed in §402(o)(2), there are still limitations as to how far a permit may be allowed to backslide. Section 402(o)(3) acts as a floor to restrict the extent to which BPJ and water quality-based permit limitations may be relaxed under the antibacksliding rule. Under this subsection, even if EPA allows a permit to backslide from its previous permit requirements, EPA may never allow the reissued permit to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the current effluent limitation guidelines for that pollutant, or which would cause the receiving waters to violate the applicable state water quality standard adopted under the authority of §303.49.

Federal regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (l)(1) have been adopted to implement the antibacksliding requirements of the CWA:

(l) Reissued permits. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (l)(2) of this section when a permit is renewed or reissued, interim effluent limitations, standards or conditions must be at least as stringent as the final effluent limitations, standards, or conditions in the previous permit (unless the circumstances on which the previous permit was based have materially and substantially changed since the time the permit was issued and would constitute cause for permit modification or revocation and reissuance under Sec. 122.62.)

(2) In the case of effluent limitations established on the basis of Section 402(a)(1)(B) of the CWA, a permit may not be renewed, reissued, or modified on the basis of effluent guidelines promulgated under section 304(b) subsequent to the original issuance of such permit, to contain effluent limitations which are less stringent than the comparable effluent limitations in the previous permit.

(i) Exceptions--A permit with respect to which paragraph (l)(2) of this section applies may be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation applicable to a pollutant, if:

(A) Material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility occurred after permit issuance which justify the application of a less stringent effluent limitation;

(B)(1) Information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance; or (2) The Administrator determines that technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of law were made in issuing the permit under section 402(a)(1)(b);

(C) A less stringent effluent limitation is necessary because of events over which the permittee has no control and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;

(D) The permittee has received a permit modification under section 301(c), 301(g), 301(h), 301(i), 301(k), 301(n), or 316(a); or

(E) The permittee has installed the treatment facilities required to meet the effluent limitations in the previous permit and has properly operated and maintained the facilities but has nevertheless been unable to achieve the previous effluent limitations, in which case the limitations in the reviewed, reissued, or modified permit may reflect the level of

pollutant control actually achieved (but shall not be less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time of permit renewal, reissuance, or modification).

(ii) Limitations. In no event may a permit with respect to which paragraph (1)(2) of this section applies be renewed, reissued, or modified to contain an effluent limitation which is less stringent than required by effluent guidelines in effect at the time the permit is renewed, reissued, or modified. In no event may such a permit to discharge into waters be renewed, issued, or modified to contain a less stringent effluent limitation if the implementation of such limitation would result in a violation of a water quality standard under section 303 applicable to such waters.

#### **a) Settleable Solids**

The existing NPDES permit for this facility contains Effluent Limitations for settleable solids (SS). The most important physical characteristic of wastewater is its total solids content. SS are an approximate measure of the quantity of sludge that will be removed by sedimentation. Low, medium and high strength wastewaters will generally contain 5 ml/l, 10 ml/l and 20 ml/l of SS, respectively. Knowledge of SS parameters is critical for proper wastewater treatment plant design, evaluating sludge quantities, operation and troubleshooting. Excessive SS in the effluent discharge are typically indicative of process upset or overloading of the system. Failure to limit and monitor for SS limits the regulators ability to assess facility operations and determine compliance. Settleable matter is a water quality objective in the Basin Plan. Failure to include an Effluent Limitations for SS threatens to allow violation of the settleable matter receiving water limitation. As such, there is a reasonable potential for settleable solids to exceed the Basin Plan's water quality standard and Effluent Limitations are required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.44. We applaud the operators if indeed they did not violate the SS limitation during the life of the existing permit; this does not however remove the reasonable potential to cause exceedances in the future during system upsets or overloading. The Permit, page F-27, states that removal of the settleable solids limitation is based on improved pretreatment and treatment systems being employed at the facility, however: Industrial Pretreatment is not generally applicable to settleable solids and a connection has not been provided; tertiary treatment will reduce effluent solids rates, settleable solids should not have been an issue except during periods of upset as discussed above. A connection to pretreatment and the addition of filtration at the facility to a reduction in settleable solids rates has not adequately addressed to justify the removal of Effluent Limitations as required under the Federal Antidegradation regulations.

#### **b) Oil and Grease**

The Permit is for a domestic wastewater treatment plant. Domestic wastewater treatment plants, by their nature, receive oil and grease in concentrations from home cooking and restaurants that present a reasonable potential to exceed the Basin Plan water quality objective for oil and grease (Basin Plan III-5.00). Confirmation sampling is not necessary to establish that domestic wastewater treatment systems contain oil and grease in concentrations that present a reasonable

potential to exceed the water quality objective. It is not unusual for sewerage systems to allow groundwater cleanup systems, such as from leaking underground tanks, to discharge into the sanitary sewer. Groundwater polluted with petroleum hydrocarbons can also infiltrate into the collection system as easily as sewage exfiltrates. The Central Valley Regional Board has a long established history of including oil and grease limitations in NPDES permits at 15 mg/l as a daily maximum and 10 mg/l as a monthly average, which has established BPTC for POTWs.

The California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 states in part that: "...the state board or the regional boards shall...issue waste discharge requirements...which apply and ensure compliance with ...water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses..." Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established, 40 CFR §122.44(d) specifies that WQBELs may be established using USEPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), proposed State criteria or a State policy interpreting narrative criteria supplemented with other relevant information, or an indicator parameter. US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that "where the preponderance of evidence clearly indicates the potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of State water quality standards (even though the data may be sparse or absent) a limit MUST be included in the permit." Failure to include an effluent limitation for oil and grease in the Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

The Permit, page F-27, states that removal of the Oil and Grease effluent limitation is based on improved pretreatment and treatment systems being employed at the facility. The Permit fails to discuss the impacts of removal of the Oil and Grease effluent Limitation will have on the Industrial Pretreatment program. The City of Woodland has developed an Industrial Pretreatment program that has been successful in controlling oil and grease following numerous years of problematic discharges. Industrial discharge rates are regulated by local limits; which in turn are based on NPDES permit effluent Limitations. The removal of an Effluent Limitation takes away the principal defense in justifying a local limit for regulating industries. Therefore removal of the effluent limitation may take away the ability of the City to legally and adequately regulate oil and grease discharges from restaurants; the principal source of oil and grease at Woodland. The basis of Woodland's success in regulating oil and grease discharges into their system will be removed upon removal of the effluent limitation. The preponderance of evidence clearly indicates that removal of the effluent limitation for oil and grease will result in the potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan water quality objective for oil and grease. The success of the pretreatment program likely has controlled an excessive oil and

grease loadings to the filtration system. Therefore, the statement regarding a connection between tertiary treatment and oil and grease is unsupported. Removal of the effluent limitation for oil and grease will inhibit the ability of the City to continue to adequately control oil and grease discharges into the wastewater system which may actually threaten to cause plugging of the filters. A connection to pretreatment and the addition of filtration at the facility to a reduction in oil and grease rates has not adequately addressed to justify the removal of Effluent Limitations as required under the Federal Antidegradation regulations.

**B. The Permit contains an inadequate antidegradation analysis that does not comply with the requirements of Section 101(a) of the Clean Water Act, Federal Regulations 40 CFR § 131.12, the State Board's Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) and California Water Code (CWC) Sections 13146 and 13247.**

The antidegradation analysis in the Permit is not simply deficient, it is literally nonexistent. The brief discussion of antidegradation requirements, in the Fact Sheet, consists only of a single skeletal, unsupported, undocumented conclusory statement totally lacking in factual analysis. NPDES permits must include any more stringent effluent limitation necessary to implement the Regional Board Basin Plan (Water Code 13377). The Tentative Permit fails to properly implement the Basin Plan's Antidegradation Policy. As discussed above the removal of Effluent Limitations for oil and grease and settleable solids reasonable threatens to allow for exceedances of the Basin Plan water quality objectives for these constituents. There is no discussion of the beneficial use impact and the proposal for uncontrolled allowances for oil and grease and settleable solids.

CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy. The State Board has adopted the Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16), which the Regional Board has incorporated into its Basin Plan. The Regional Board is required by the CWC to comply with the Antidegradation Policy.

Section 101(a) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the basis for the antidegradation policy, states that the objective of the Act is to "restore and maintain the chemical, biological and physical integrity of the nation's waters." Section 303(d)(4) of the CWA carries this further, referring explicitly to the need for states to satisfy the antidegradation regulations at 40 CFR § 131.12 before taking action to lower water quality. These regulations (40 CFR § 131.12(a)) describe the federal antidegradation policy and dictate that states must adopt both a policy at least as stringent as the federal policy as well as implementing procedures.

California's antidegradation policy is composed of both the federal antidegradation policy and the State Board's Resolution 68-16 (State Water Resources Control Board, Water Quality Order 86-17, p. 20 (1986) ("Order 86-17"); Memorandum from Chief Counsel William Attwater, SWRCB to Regional Board Executive Officers, "federal Antidegradation Policy," pp. 2, 18 (Oct. 7, 1987) ("State Antidegradation Guidance")). As a state policy, with inclusion in the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), the antidegradation policy is binding on all of the Regional Boards (Water Quality Order 86-17, pp. 17-18).

The Regional Board must apply the antidegradation policy whenever it takes an action that will lower water quality (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 3, 5, 18, and Region IX Guidance, p. 1). Application of the policy does not depend on whether the action will actually impair beneficial uses (State Antidegradation Guidance, p. 6). Actions that trigger use of the antidegradation policy include issuance, re-issuance, and modification of NPDES and Section 404 permits and waste discharge requirements, waiver of waste discharge requirements, issuance of variances, relocation of discharges, issuance of cleanup and abatement orders, increases in discharges due to industrial production and/or municipal growth and/or other sources, exceptions from otherwise applicable water quality objectives, etc. (State Antidegradation Guidance, pp. 7-10, Region IX Guidance, pp. 2-3). Both the state and federal policies apply to point and nonpoint source pollution (State Antidegradation Guidance p. 6, Region IX Guidance, p. 4).

The Permit fails to include any discussion of the impacts of removal of the effluent limitations for oil and grease and settleable solids.

##### **5. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED.**

CSPA is a non-profit, environmental organization that has a direct interest in reducing pollution to the waters of the Central Valley. CSPA's members benefit directly from the waters in the form of recreational hiking, photography, fishing, swimming, hunting, bird watching, boating, consumption of drinking water and scientific investigation. Additionally, these waters are an important resource for recreational and commercial fisheries. Central Valley waterways also provide significant wildlife values important to the mission and purpose of the Petitioners. This wildlife value includes critical nesting and feeding grounds for resident water birds, essential habitat for endangered species and other plants and animals, nursery areas for fish and shellfish and their aquatic food organisms, and numerous city and county parks and open space areas. CSPA's members reside in communities whose economic prosperity depends, in part, upon the quality of water. CSPA has actively promoted the protection of fisheries and water quality throughout California before state and federal agencies, the State Legislature and Congress and regularly participates in administrative and judicial proceedings on behalf of its members to protect, enhance, and restore declining aquatic resources. CSPA member's health, interests and pocketbooks are directly harmed by the failure of the Regional Board to develop an effective and



legally defensible program addressing discharges to waters of the state and nation.

**6. THE SPECIFIC ACTION BY THE STATE OR REGIONAL BOARD WHICH PETITIONER REQUESTS.**

CSPA seeks an Order by the State Board to:

- A. Vacate Order No. R5-2009-0010 (NPDES No. CA0077950) and remand to the Regional Board with instructions prepare and circulate a new tentative order that comports with regulatory requirements.
- B. Alternatively, prepare, circulate and issue a new order that is protective of identified beneficial uses and comports with regulatory requirements.

CSPA, however, requests that the State Board hold in abeyance further action on this Petition for up to two years or further notice by Petitioners, whichever comes first. CSPA anticipates filing one or more additional petitions for review challenging NPDES permit decisions by the Regional Board concerning the issues raised in this Petition in the coming months. For economy of the State Board and all parties, CSPA is endeavoring to consolidate these petitions and/or resolve the common issues presented by these petitions. Accordingly, CSPA urges that holding this Petition in abeyance for now is a sensible approach.

**7. A STATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION.**

CSPA's arguments and points of authority are adequately detailed in the above comments and our 26 December 2008 comment letter. Should the State Board have additional questions regarding the issues raised in this petition, CSPA will provide additional briefing on any such questions. The petitioners believe that an evidentiary hearing before the State Board will not be necessary to resolve the issues raised in this petition. However, CSPA welcomes the opportunity to present oral argument and respond to any questions the State Board may have regarding this petition.

**8. A STATEMENT THAT THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL BOARD AND TO THE DISCHARGERS, IF NOT THE PETITIONER.**

A true and correct copy of this petition, without attachment, was sent electronically and by First Class Mail to Ms. Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114. A true and correct copy of this petition, without attachment, was sent to the Discharger in care of: Mr.

Gary Wegener, Public Works Director, City of Woodland, 300 First Street, Woodland, CA, 95695.

**9. A STATEMENT THAT THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION WERE PRESENTED TO THE REGIONAL BOARD BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED, OR AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE PETITIONER COULD NOT RAISE THOSE OBJECTIONS BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD.**

CSPA presented the issues addressed in this petition to the Regional Board in 26 December 2008 comment letter that were accepted into the record. If you have any questions regarding this petition, please contact Bill Jennings at (209) 464-5067 or Michael Jackson at (530) 283-1007.

Dated: 5 March 2009

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Jennings", is written over the typed name.

Bill Jennings, Executive Director  
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachment No. 1: Order No. R5-2009-0010

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD****CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114  
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER NO. R5-2009-0010****NPDES NO. CA0077950**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
CITY OF WOODLAND  
CITY OF WOODLAND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITY  
YOLO COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	City of Woodland
<b>Name of Facility</b>	City of Woodland Water Pollution Control Facility
<b>Facility Address</b>	42929 County Road 24, Woodland, CA, 95776
	Yolo County

The discharge by the City of Woodland from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 2. Discharge Location**

<b>Discharge Point</b>	<b>Effluent Description</b>	<b>Discharge Point Latitude</b>	<b>Discharge Point Longitude</b>	<b>Receiving Water</b>
001	Treated WWTP Effluent	38°, 40', 54" N	121 °,38',42" W	Tule Canal

**Table 3. Administrative Information**

This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on:	<b>5 February 2009</b>
This Order shall become effective on:	<b>50 Days After Permit Adoption Date</b>
This Order shall expire on:	<b>1 February 2014</b>
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than:	<b>180 days prior to the Order expiration date</b>

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Order No. R5-2003-0031-R01 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **5 February 2009**.

*Original Signed By*

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

## Table of Contents

I.	Facility Information .....	3
II.	Findings .....	3
III.	Discharge Prohibitions .....	9
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications .....	9
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 .....	9
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 .....	9
	2. Interim Effluent Limitations .....	10
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable .....	11
	C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable .....	11
V.	Receiving Water Limitations .....	11
	A. Surface Water Limitations .....	11
	B. Groundwater Limitations .....	13
VI.	Provisions .....	13
	A. Standard Provisions .....	13
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements .....	17
	C. Special Provisions .....	18
	1. Reopener Provisions .....	18
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements .....	19
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention .....	22
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications .....	23
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) .....	24
	6. Other Special Provisions .....	27
	7. Compliance Schedules .....	28
VII.	Compliance Determination .....	29

## List of Tables

Table 1.	Discharger Information .....	Cover
Table 2.	Discharge Location .....	Cover
Table 3.	Administrative Information .....	Cover
Table 4.	Facility Information .....	3
Table 5.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses .....	5
Table 6.	Effluent Limitations .....	9
Table 7.	Interim Effluent Limitations .....	10

## List of Attachments

Attachment A – Definitions .....	A-1
Attachment B – Map .....	B-1
Attachment C – Flow Schematic .....	C-1
Attachment D – Standard Provisions .....	D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) .....	E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet .....	F-1

## I. FACILITY INFORMATION

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 4. Facility Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	City of Woodland
<b>Name of Facility</b>	City of Woodland Water Pollution Control Facility
<b>Facility Address</b>	42929 County Road 24
	Woodland, CA, 95776
	Yolo County
<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Mark Hierholzer, Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF) Superintendent, (530)-406-5112
<b>Mailing Address</b>	300 First Street, Woodland, CA, 95695
<b>Type of Facility</b>	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
<b>Facility Design Flow</b>	10.4 million gallons per day

## II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Regional Water Board), finds:

**A. Background.** The City of Woodland (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. CA0077950 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. R5-2003-0031-R01. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 28 September 2007 and applied for a NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 10.4 mgd of treated wastewater from City of Woodland Water Pollution Control Facility, hereinafter Facility.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the "Discharger" or "permittee" in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

**B. Facility Description.** The Discharger owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system and provides sewerage service to domestic, commercial, and industrial users of City of Woodland. The treatment system consists of headworks, secondary treatment, tertiary filtration, ultraviolet disinfection, and sludge handling. Wastewater is discharged from Discharge Point 001 (see table on cover page) to the Tule Canal, a water of the United States, and a part of the Yolo Bypass within Sacramento Delta Hydrologic Unit. A portion of the wastewater may be diverted and treated in the Facility's pond system. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

**C. Legal Authorities.** This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental

Protection Agency (USEPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).

- D. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for Order requirements, is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E are also incorporated into this Order.
- E. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21100-21177.
- F. Technology-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)<sup>1</sup> require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. This Order includes technology-based effluent limitations based on tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements that meet both the technology-based secondary treatment standards for POTWs and protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F).
- G. Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC Section 13241 in establishing these requirements. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be established using: (1) EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed State criterion or policy interpreting the State's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

**H. Water Quality Control Plans.** The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised August 2006), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Tule Canal is physically part of the Yolo Bypass. Beneficial uses applicable to Tule Canal are as follows:

**Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Tule Canal	<p><u>Existing:</u>  Agricultural supply (AGR);  Contact (REC-1) and non-contact (REC-2) water recreation;  Warm freshwater habitat (WARM);  Spawning, Reproduction, and /or Early Development (SPWN);  Wildlife habitat (WILD);  Ground water recharge (GWR);  Freshwater replenishment (FRESH).</p> <p><u>Potential:</u>  Cold freshwater habitat (COLD)</p>

Requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan.

**I. National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** USEPA adopted the NTR on December 22, 1992, and later amended it on May 4, 1995 and November 9, 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On May 18, 2000, USEPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on February 13, 2001. These rules contain water quality criteria for priority pollutants.

**J. State Implementation Policy.** On March 2, 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP

on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.

**K. Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements.** In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with Clean Water Act section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board has concluded that where the Regional Water Board's Basin Plan allows for schedules of compliance and the Regional Water Board is newly interpreting a narrative standard, it may include schedules of compliance in the permit to meet effluent limits that implement a narrative standard. See *In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements for Avon Refinery* (State Board Order WQ 2001-06 at pp. 53-55). See also *Communities for a Better Environment et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, 34 Cal.Rptr.3d 396, 410 (2005). The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits for water quality objectives that are adopted after the date of adoption of the Basin Plan, which was September 25, 1995 (See Basin Plan at page IV-16). Consistent with the State Water Board's Order in the CBE matter, the Regional Water Board has the discretion to include compliance schedules in NPDES permits when it is including an effluent limitation that is a "new interpretation" of a narrative water quality objective. This conclusion is also consistent with the United States Environmental Protection Agency policies and administrative decisions. See, e.g., *Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy*. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a schedule of compliance, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to Water Code section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to Water Code section 13301 where it finds that the discharger is violating or threatening to violate the permit. The Regional Water Board will consider the merits of each case in determining whether it is appropriate to include a compliance schedule in a permit, and, consistent with the Basin Plan, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as practicable to achieve compliance with the objectives, criteria, or effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

For CTR constituents, Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that, based on a Discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for an existing Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with an effluent limitation derived from a CTR criterion, compliance schedules may be allowed in an NPDES permit. Unless an exception has been granted under section 5.3 of the SIP, a compliance schedule may not exceed 5 years from the date that the permit is issued or reissued, nor may it extend beyond 10 years from the effective date of the SIP (or May 18, 2010) to establish and comply with CTR criterion-based effluent limitations. Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation that exceeds 1 year, the Order must include interim numeric limitations for that constituent or parameter. Where allowed by the Basin Plan, compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations or discharge specifications may also be granted to allow time to implement a new or revised water quality objective. This Order includes compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations. A detailed discussion of the basis for the compliance schedule(s) and interim effluent limitation(s) and/or discharge specifications is included in the Fact Sheet.



- L. Alaska Rule.** On March 30, 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised state and tribal water quality standards (WQS) become effective for CWA purposes. (40 C.F.R. § 131.21; 65 Fed. Reg. 24641 (April 27, 2000).) Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after May 30, 2000, must be approved by USEPA before being used for CWA purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by May 30, 2000 may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by USEPA.
- M. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.** This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. The water quality-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on ammonia and selenium. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards. These limitations are more stringent than required by the CWA. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for BOD, TSS, turbidity and pathogens that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in the Fact Sheet. In addition, the Regional Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on May 1, 2001. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "*applicable water quality standards for purposes of the [Clean Water] Act*" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the technology-based requirements of the CWA and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA.

- N. Antidegradation Policy.** Section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 is consistent with the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that

existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet, the permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

- O. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40, Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. Some effluent limitations in this Order are less stringent than those in the previous Order. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet, this relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.
- P. Monitoring and Reporting.** Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. This Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.
- Q. Standard and Special Provisions.** Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42. The Regional Water Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Discharger. A rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the attached Fact Sheet.
- R. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and VI.C. of this Order are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- S. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe Waste Discharge Requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of notification are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.
- T. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Regional Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.

### III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A. Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in the Findings is prohibited.
- B. The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.
- D. The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the collection, treatment, and disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.

### IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

#### A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

##### 1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location Eff-001 as described in the attached MRP (Attachment E):

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 6:

**Table 6. Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD 5-day @ 20 °C	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	867	1301	1735	--	--
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	867	1301	1735	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.8	--	2.2	--	--
Selenium	ug/L	3.2	--	9.2	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	0.28	--	0.80	--	--

<sup>1</sup>. Based upon a design treatment capacity of 10.4 mgd.

- b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of BOD 5-day 20°C and total suspended solids shall not be less than 85 percent.

- c. **Mercury.** The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.088 lbs/month.
- d. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
  - i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
  - ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- e. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.
- f. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
  - i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
  - ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
  - iii. 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.
- g. **Average Daily Discharge Flow.** The Average Daily Discharge Flow shall not exceed 10.4 mgd.

## 2. Interim Effluent Limitations

- a. During the period beginning on the **Permit Effective Date** and ending **17 May 2010**, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP. These interim effluent limitations shall apply in lieu of the corresponding final effluent limitations specified for the same parameters during the time period indicated in this provision.

**Table 7. Interim Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Ammonia <sup>1</sup>	mg/L	--	--	3.7	--	--
Selenium	µg/L	--	--	31	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Reported as Total.

- b. **Electrical Conductivity.** Beginning the effective date of this Order, the effluent electrical conductivity shall not exceed 1835 umhos/cm as an annual average.
- c. **Boron.** Beginning the effective date of this Order, the effluent boron concentration shall not exceed 3.1 mg/L as an annual average.

**B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**

**C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water Limitations**

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. The discharge shall not cause the following in Tule Canal:

1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than one sample for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than ten percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
2. **Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
3. **Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
4. **Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
  - a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
  - b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
  - c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.
6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5, raised above 8.5, nor changed by more than 0.5 units. A 1-month averaging period may be applied when calculating the pH change of <0.5 units.

9. **Pesticides:**

- a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
- b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
- c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by USEPA or the Executive Officer.
- d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR §131.12.).
- e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable.
- f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15.
- g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.

10. **Radioactivity:**

- a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.

11. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

12. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

13. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

14. **Taste and Odors.** Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

15. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F.

16. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant,

animal, or aquatic life.

**17. Turbidity.** The turbidity to increase as follows:

- a. More than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU) where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs.
- b. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
- c. More than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
- d. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

#### **B. Groundwater Limitations**

Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the WWTP, in combination with other sources, shall not cause the underlying groundwater to contain waste constituents in concentrations greater than background water quality.

### **VI. PROVISIONS**

#### **A. Standard Provisions**

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D of this Order.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions:
  - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, Division 3, Chapter 26.
  - b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
    - i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;
    - ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
    - iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
    - iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.
- *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

The Regional Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Regional Water Board's own motion.

- c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under Section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Regional Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

- d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under Sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
- i. contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or
  - ii. controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

- e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.
- f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include



- g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by USEPA under Section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. The discharge of any radiological, chemical or biological warfare agent or high-level, radiological waste is prohibited.
- i. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- j. Safeguard to electric power failure:
  - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
  - ii. Upon written request by the Regional Water Board the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past five years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Regional Water Board.
  - iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Regional Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within ninety days of having been advised in writing by the Regional Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Regional Water Board and USEPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Regional Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- k. The Discharger, upon written request of the Regional Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under Regional Water Board Standard Provision VI.A.2.m.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Regional Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

- l. A publicly owned treatment works (POTW) whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last three years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in four years, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Regional Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.
- m. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- n. Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Regional Water Board and USEPA.

- o. The Discharger shall conduct analysis on any sample provided by USEPA as part of the Discharge Monitoring Quality Assurance (DMQA) program. The results of any such analysis shall be submitted to USEPA's DMQA manager.
- p. Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- q. All monitoring and analysis instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy.
- r. The Discharger shall file with the Regional Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in the Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to this Order.
- s. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Regional Water Board, and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.
- t. The Regional Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the CWC, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- u. For POTWs, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (CWC section 1211).
- v. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, 1-hour average effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation contained in this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by Attachment D, Section V.E.1 [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

#### **B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements**

- 1. The Discharger shall comply with the MRP, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E of this Order.

## C. Special Provisions

### 1. Reopener Provisions

- a. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, whole effluent toxicity, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.
- b. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR section 122.62, including:
  - i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to Section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
  - ii. When new information, that was not available at the time of permit issuance, would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and the mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Regional Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the interim mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Pollution Prevention.** This Order requires the Discharger prepare pollution prevention plans following CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) for ammonia and selenium. Based on a review of the pollution prevention plans, this Order may be reopened for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for these constituents.
- e. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger completed a Salinity Control Plan in May 2005 which evaluated the salinity sources in the wastewater. The Discharger shall complete an update to this report to address sources of salinity and recommended minimization strategies. The plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 1 year of the adoption date of this Order** for the approval by the Executive Officer.
- f. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE.

Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.

## **2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements**

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section V.). Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the toxicity numeric monitoring trigger established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent reoccurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Work Plan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.
  - i. **Initial Investigative Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Work Plan.** Within 90 days of the effective date of this Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer. This should be a one to two page document including, at minimum:
    - a) A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that will be used to identify potential causes and sources of effluent toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;
    - b) A description of the facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and
    - c) A discussion of who will conduct the Toxicity Identification Evaluation, if necessary (i.e. an in-house expert or outside contractor).
  - ii. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. WET testing results exceeding the monitoring trigger during

accelerated monitoring demonstrates a pattern of toxicity and requires the Discharger to initiate a TRE to address the effluent toxicity.

- iii. **Numeric Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is  $> 1 \text{ TUc}$  (where  $\text{TUc} = 100/\text{NOEC}$ ). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE.
- iv. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four (4) chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e. one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:
  - a) If the results of four (4) consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.
  - b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (i.e. temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four (4) consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.
  - c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Regional Water Board including, at minimum:
    - 1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including TRE WET monitoring schedule;
    - 2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
    - 3) A schedule for these actions.

Within sixty (60) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board a TRE Work Plan

for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Work Plan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Work Plan must be developed in accordance with EPA guidance<sup>2</sup>.

- b. **Improvements to Potable Water Supply.** The Discharger shall provide updates to the Regional Water Board as to the progress of improving the City of Woodland's potable water supply. In previous studies, the City determined that improving the potable water supply was the most appropriate and cost-effective means to reduce the effluent levels of electrical conductivity, boron, selenium, and mercury. The Discharger shall comply with the Annual Operations Reporting schedule (shown below) in providing the Regional Water Board with the status of the potable water supply improvement project.

If no discernable progress is being made by the City of Woodland, the Regional Water Board may reopen the permit, as necessary, to include appropriate effluent limitations for these constituents.

**Potable Water Supply Improvement Project**

<u>Task</u>	<u>Compliance Dates</u>
Submit Progress Report within the Annual Operations Report	30 January each year for the duration of this Order

- c. **Groundwater Monitoring.** The Discharger has expanded the existing groundwater monitoring network. All monitoring wells comply with the appropriate standards as described in California Well Standards Bulletin 74-90 (June 1991) and Water Well Standards: State of California Bulletin 74-81 (December 1981), and any more stringent standards adopted by the Discharger or County pursuant to CWC section 13801.

The Discharger has completed five quarters of monitoring to characterize natural background quality of local groundwater in the vicinity of the WPCF pond system. This report, City of Woodland Hydrogeologic Evaluation Report, July 2008 ECO:LOGIC Engineering, was a requirement of the previous permit and was submitted to the Regional Water Board in August 2008.

For each groundwater monitoring parameter/constituent identified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section VIII.B.), the report presents a summary of monitoring data, calculation of the concentration in background monitoring wells, and a comparison of background groundwater quality to that in wells used to monitor the facility. Determination of background quality was made using the methods described in Title 27 California Code of Regulations Section 20415(e)(10), and was based on quarterly data from January 2007 until March 2008. For each monitoring parameter/constituent, the

<sup>2</sup> See Attachment F (Fact Sheet) Section VII.B.2.a. for a list of EPA guidance documents that must be considered in development of the TRE Workplan.

report compares measured concentrations for compliance monitoring wells with the calculated background concentration.

The study assessed groundwater quality at both background and compliance locations. Water quality goals were exceeded for conductivity, total dissolved solids, boron, and sodium, at all monitored locations, iron at Monitoring Well 12 (MW-12), manganese at MW-5, MW-6, MW-9, MW-11, MW-14, and MW-15; chloride at MW-1, MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-7, MW-10, MW-11, and MW-15; sulfate at MW-15; and, nitrate-N at MW-4.

The statistical analysis was conducted to determine if the presences of evaporated effluent at these locations was resulting in higher solute concentrations, compared to background values and/or water quality objectives. Based on this analysis it was found that all of the downgradient wells (MW-2, MW-3, MW-5, MW-6, MW-7, MW-11) contained salts at higher concentrations than background, and at statistically significant levels. In addition to general mineral chemistry, pathogen mobility was also assessed via analysis of virus. It was found that none of the groundwater monitoring wells contained virus at detectable limits, indicating that pathogen mobility in groundwater is low, in contrast to assessed surface water samples.

The Discharger shall submit a technical report which assesses the WPCF and potable water system components with respect to BPTC and minimizes the WPCF's impact on groundwater quality.

### 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Pollution Prevention Plan for Ammonia and Selenium.** The Discharger shall prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan for selenium and ammonia in accordance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plan are outlined in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F, section VII.B.3.c. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the pollution prevention plan shall be completed and submitted **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The Pollution Prevention Plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within one (1) year following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).
- b. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger completed a Salinity Control Plan in May 2005 which evaluated the salinity sources in the wastewater. The Discharger shall complete an update to this report to address sources of salinity and recommended minimization strategies. The plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 1 year of the adoption date of this Order** for the approval by the Executive Officer.



#### **4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications**

##### **a. Ultraviolet Disinfection (UV) System**

The Discharger shall operate the UV disinfection system to provide a minimum UV dose per bank of 100 millijoules per square centimeter ( $\text{mJ}/\text{cm}^2$ ) at peak daily flow, unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Public Health, and shall maintain an adequate dose for disinfection while discharging to Tule Canal, unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Public Health.

- The Discharger shall provide continuous, reliable monitoring of flow, UV transmittance, UV power, and turbidity.
- The Discharger shall operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5% of the time within a 24-hour period, and 10 NTU, at any time.
- The UV transmittance (at 254 nanometers) in the wastewater exiting the UV disinfection system shall not fall below 55 percent of maximum at any time.
- The quartz sleeves and cleaning system components must be visually inspected per the manufacturer's operations manual for physical wear (scoring, solarization, seal leaks, cleaning fluid levels, etc.) and to check the efficacy of the cleaning system.
- The lamp sleeves must be cleaned periodically as necessary to meet the requirements.
- Lamps must be replaced per the manufacturer's operations manual, or sooner, if there are indications the lamps are failing to provide adequate disinfection. Lamp age and lamp replacement records must be maintained.
- The facility must be operated in accordance with an operations and maintenance program that assures adequate disinfection.

##### **b. Treatment Pond Operating Requirements.**

- i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
- ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
- iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,

- a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
  - b) Weeds shall be minimized.
  - c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
- iv. Freeboard in the ponds shall not be less than two feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow), except if lesser freeboard does not threaten the integrity of the pond, no overflow of the pond occurs, and lesser freeboard is due to direct precipitation or storm water runoff occurring as a result of annual precipitation with greater than a 100-year recurrence interval, or a storm event with an intensity greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.
- v. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than two feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- vi. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with Land Discharge Specification v.

## **5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**

### **a. Pretreatment Requirements.**

- i. The Discharger shall implement its approved pretreatment program and the program shall be an enforceable condition of this Order. If the Discharger fails to perform the pretreatment functions, the Regional Water Board, the State Water Board or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) may take enforcement actions against the Discharger as authorized by the CWA.
- ii. The Discharger shall enforce the Pretreatment Standards promulgated under sections 307(b), 307(c), and 307(d) of the Clean Water Act. The Discharger shall perform the pretreatment functions required by 40 CFR Part 403 including, but not limited to:
  - a) Adopting the legal authority required by 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1);
  - b) Enforcing the Pretreatment Standards of 40 CFR 403.5 and 403.6;
  - c) Implementing procedures to ensure compliance as required by 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2); and

- d) Providing funding and personnel for implementation and enforcement of the pretreatment program as required by 40 CFR 403.8(f)(3).
- iii. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system, where incompatible wastes are:
  - a) Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;
  - b) Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;
  - c) Solid or viscous wastes in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation or treatment works;
  - d) Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD, *etc.*), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;
  - e) Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F), unless the Regional Water Board approves alternate temperature limits;
  - f) Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;
  - g) Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and:
  - h) Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Discharger.
- iv. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewerage system that, either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:
  - a) Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order, or:

- b) Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.

**b. Sludge/Biosolids Discharge Specifications**

- i. Collected screenings, residual sludge, biosolids, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with *Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste*, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, disposal, or reuse at sites (i.e., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a regional water quality control board will satisfy these specifications.
- ii. Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.
- iii. The treatment of sludge generated at the Facility shall be confined to the Facility property and conducted in a manner that precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate Groundwater Limitations V.B. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and biosolids on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate Groundwater Limitations V.B.
- iv. The use and disposal of biosolids shall comply with existing Federal and State laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 CFR 503. If the State Water Board and the Regional Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 CFR 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 CFR 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.

**c. Biosolids Disposal Requirements**

- i. The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program for biosolids disposal contained in Attachment E.
- ii. Any proposed change in biosolids use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and U.S. EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.

- iii. The Discharger is encouraged to comply with the "Manual of Good Practice for Agricultural Land Application of Biosolids" developed by the California Water Environment Association.

**d. Biosolids Storage Requirements**

- i. Facilities for the storage of Class B biosolids shall be located, designed and maintained to restrict public access to biosolids.
- ii. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed and maintained to prevent washout or inundation from a storm or flood with a return frequency of 100 years.
- iii. Biosolids storage facilities, which contain biosolids, shall be designed and maintained to contain all storm water falling on the biosolids storage area during a rainfall year with a return frequency of 100 years.
- iv. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed, maintained and operated to minimize the generation of leachate.

- e. **Collection System.** On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order 2006-0003 and any future revisions thereto. Order 2006-0003 requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDR. By November 2, 2006, the Discharger is required by that Order, not incorporated by reference herein, to apply for coverage under State Water Board Order 2006-0003 for operation of its wastewater collection system.

Regardless of the coverage obtained under Order 2006-0003, the Discharger's collection system is part of the treatment system that is subject to this Order. As such, pursuant to federal regulations, the Discharger must properly operate and maintain its collection system [40 CFR section 122.41(e)], report any non-compliance [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6) and (7)], and mitigate any discharge from the collection system in violation of this Order [40 CFR. section 122.41(d)].

- f. **Electronic Notification System.** This permit, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program which is a part of this permit, requires that certain parameters be monitored on a continuous basis. The wastewater treatment plant is not staffed on a full time basis. Permit violations or system upsets can go undetected during this period. The Discharger has an electronic system for operator notification for continuous recording device alarms.

**6. Other Special Provisions**

- a. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall

notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Regional Water Board.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the State of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Regional Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the Federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, Section V.B.) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

## **7. Compliance Schedules**

### **a. Compliance Schedules for Final Effluent Limitations for Ammonia and Selenium**

- i. **By 18 May 2010**, the Discharger shall comply with the final effluent limitations for ammonia and selenium. On 13 August 2008, the Discharger submitted a compliance schedule justification for ammonia and selenium. The compliance schedule justification included all items specified in Paragraph 3, items (a) through (d), of section 2.1 of the SIP. As this compliance schedule is greater than one year, the Discharger shall submit semi-annual progress reports in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.)
- ii. **Corrective Action Plan/Implementation Schedule.** The Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final effluent limitations for ammonia and selenium **within six months from the effective date of this Order.**
- iii. **Pollution Prevention Plan.** The Discharger shall prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan for ammonia and selenium, in accordance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plan are outlined in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the pollution prevention plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The Pollution Prevention Plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within one (1) year following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).

- i. **Treatment Feasibility Study (Ammonia).** The Discharger is required to perform an engineering treatment feasibility study examining the feasibility, costs and benefits of different treatment options that may be required to remove ammonia from the discharge. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the treatment feasibility study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The treatment feasibility study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within one (1) year following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).
- ii. **Treatment Feasibility Study (Selenium).** The Discharger has stated that elevated selenium within the City's potable water (groundwater) result in elevated selenium levels within the effluent. The Discharger is pursuing a new water surface supply which contains significantly lower levels of selenium in conjunction with Pollution Prevention Plans for reducing other potential sources of selenium within the wastewater. If the water supply project were to be delayed, the Discharger shall perform an engineering treatment feasibility study examining the feasibility, costs and benefits of different treatment options that may be required to remove selenium from the discharge. If the water supply project is delayed this permit may be reopened and a time schedule for treatment feasibility study shall be established.

## VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

Compliance with the effluent limitations contained in section IV of this Order will be determined as specified below:

- A. **BOD and TSS Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD and TSS required in sections IV.A.1 shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations sections IV.A.1 for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of 20°C BOD (5-day) and total suspended solids in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.
- B. **Total Mercury Mass Loading Effluent Limitations.** The procedures for calculating mass loadings are as follows:
  1. The total pollutant mass load for each individual calendar month shall be determined using an average of all concentration data collected that month and the corresponding total monthly flow. All monitoring data collected under the monitoring and reporting program, pretreatment program and any special studies shall be used for these calculations.

2. In calculating compliance, the Discharger shall count all non-detect measures at one-half of the detection level. If compliance with the effluent limitation is not attained due to the non-detect contribution, the Discharger shall improve and implement available analytical capabilities and compliance shall be evaluated with consideration of the detection limits.
- C. **Average Daily Discharge Flow Effluent Limitations.** The Average Daily Discharge Flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the Average Daily Discharge Flow effluent limitations will be measured at times when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring.
- D. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.).** For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last seven days for which analyses have been completed. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 2.2 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance for that parameter for that 1 day only within the reporting period.
- E. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Effluent Limitation.** Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE/TIE provisions contained at section VI.C.2.a shall constitute compliance with effluent limitation IV.A.1.e for chronic whole effluent toxicity.